

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-35 and 37-42 are pending in the present application. The previously presented claims, i.e., claims 1-35 and 37-38 remain unchanged notwithstanding the new grounds of rejection manifested in the Office Action. New claims 39-42 readable on the elected invention/species have been added to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are believed entitled. The new claims find solid support in the *original* specification and drawings, especially FIG. 1, the sentence bridging pages 8-9, paragraph 0032, paragraph 0037 lines 2-3, and paragraph 0038 lines 3-4.

No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The new grounds of rejection are noted. Applicants appreciate the Office's effort in clarifying the Office's obviousness rationale in the Office Action by

- adding several quotations from *Rive* at pages 7-8, and
- highlighting the word "comply" on page 4, line 8 from bottom.

However, it does *not* appear to Applicants that the Office has changed the substance of the previous rejections, i.e., it is still the Office's position that it would have been obvious to combine *Bogdan* with *Rive* and that the combination would teach or disclose all claim features of at least the independent claims.

To the extent that the "new" grounds of rejection are essentially the same as the previous ones, Applicants respectfully *traverse*. The traversing arguments have been detailed in the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed April 7, 2008 and are incorporated by reference herein in their entirety.

The Office is kindly asked to respond to the traversing arguments raised in the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review so that prosecution of the instant application could be advanced

meaningfully. The *main* traversing arguments are summarized herein below for the Office's convenience of review.

1. *Rive* is non-analogous art which is not combinable with *Bogdan*.
2. Even if assuming *arguendo* that the references were combinable, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the following features of the independent claims
 - a. The display properties of the original icon appearance are backed-up before the sample icon's appearance is changed.
 - b. The display properties that are backed-up (i.e., the display properties of the original icon appearance) are different from those (the sample icon's appearance) that are changed.
 - c. The display properties to be backed-up are first determined to be valid or not.

The Office's cooperation in clarifying *at least* the above listed issues would be highly appreciated and is respectfully requested.

Applicants note that the Office, by highlighting the word "comply," might have responded to point 2.c above. If so, the Office's position is respectfully traversed, because the cited portion of *Bogdan* again relates to driver's (i.e., software) compatibility rather than display properties (i.e., data) as presently claimed. In addition, any backing-up operation in *Bogdan* is not performed if the driver is determined to be compatible ("valid"). The *Bogdan* "backing-up" operation and the driver's compatibility (validity) are two unrelated issues and are not related by the term "if" as recited in the current independent claims. Therefore, the Office's cited portion of *Bogdan* does not support the position that *Bogdan* teaches or suggests claim feature 2.c.

All previously presented claims should be considered patentable for the reasons presented above and before.

The new claims should be considered patentable by virtue of their dependency. The new claims are also separately patentable for the following reasons.

As to claim 39, the applied references especially *Bogdan*, do not teach or suggest two sets of display properties,

- one is associated with the original icon appearance and is backed-up before changing the sample icon's appearance (see claim 1), while
- the other is associated with the current icon appearance and is temporarily stored before changing the icon appearance of the display system.

The latter are also temporarily stored at a different memory location from the former, and hence, claim 39 calls for two different stored (i.e., backed-up and temporarily stored) sets of display properties.

Bogdan discloses, if at all, only a single set of stored (cached) “display properties” at step 60. Therefore, the reference singly or in combination with *Rive* does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 39.

New claims 40-41 further recite that depending on the user's different commands, the display properties of the display system will be restored to different stored (i.e., backed-up and temporarily stored) sets of display properties. The claim feature finds support in the above listed sections of the original specification. For example, paragraph 0032 discloses that if the Cancel button (first command) is selected, the display properties of the display system will be restored to a first set, i.e., the temporarily stored display properties, whereas if the Reset button (second command) is selected, the display properties of the display system will be restored to a second set, i.e., the backed-up display properties. Embodiments of the claimed invention provides the user with greater flexibility in returning to more than one previous settings if he/she does not like the new setting or appearance of the display. The prior art, *Bogdan* inclusive, does not address this issue and often causes the user frustrations and inconvenience. *See* the specification at paragraph 0005, the last sentence.

New claim 42 recites that the invalid display properties, if detected, are changed to valid ones before generating the registry subkey. The applied references do not appear to fairly teach or suggest this feature.

Each of the rejections has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/

Yoon S. Ham

Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 20, 2008